

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/761,662	WOLFE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	James Mackey	1722	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Amended

(1) James Mackey.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) David King.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 26 April 2006

**Time:** 2:15PM EST

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*1-5, 19, 21, 22, 24*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:  
Authorization was given to cancel non-elected claims 1-5; to change the dependence of claims 19 and 22 to depend from claim 18 in order to provide proper antecedent basis for "the piercing tip"; to change the dependence of claim 21 to depend from claim 20 in order to provide proper antecedent basis for "the piston retraction means"; and to change the dependence of claim 24 to depend from independent claim 17 rather than independent claim 6, since the subject matter of claim 24 is already recited in independent claim 6..